



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,329	02/20/2002	Michael Barnett	3382-61109	9799
26119	7590	12/02/2005	EXAMINER	
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP			RAMPURIA, SATISH	
121 S.W. SALMON STREET				
SUITE 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PORLTAND, OR 97204			2191	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,329	BARNETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Satish S. Rampuria	2191

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants argues that Leiba neither teaches nor suggests applying the software implementation and the software specification to produce a conformance-test enabled implementation comprising portions of the software implementation and the software specification integrated into a same body of code wherein nondeterministic choices of the software specification result in assigning a corresponding choice of the conformance-test enabled implementation to a variable.

In response to Applicants arguments, Leiba discloses a test engine and method for verifying conformance for server applications where Leiba teaches the limitations as claimed in claim 1 (see the Office Action mailed on 7/5/05). Leiba specifically discloses applying the software implementation and the software specification to produce a conformance-test enabled implementation (col. 2, lines 11-12 "performing compliance testing based on... requirements") comprising portions of the software implementation and the software specification integrated into a same body of code (col. 2 lines 65-67 to col. 3, lines 1-24 "the execution engine... include a response analyzer for non-deterministic ordering of responses and ordering of components within the responses... analyzer... provides... for testing in... client sessions... include a test generator... according to an input specification... test generator... provide a stress test with stopping criteria for testing durability of the server application... test generator... include a test sequence derived from a state machine... test sequence... derived from the state machine based on probabilistic transitions... response analyzer...") wherein nondeterministic choices of the software specification result in assigning a corresponding choice of the conformance-test enabled implementation to a variable (col. 2, lines 28-31 "each response ...non-deterministic... responses... each response"). Further, Applicant alleges that in the cited portion nothing is said about non-deterministic choices, which are defined in the Application on page 17, lines 10-14. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, the word choices is very broad term. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).